



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Art Unit: 2155
Examiner: Mr. Shawki Saif Ismail

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:

Applicant	:	Shin TORIGOE et al)	
)	
Serial No.	:	10/720,690)	
)	
Filed	:	November 25, 2003)	<u>REPLY BRIEF</u>
)	
For	:	WEB PAGE UPDATE)	
		NOTIFICATION METHOD AND)	
		WEB PAGE UPDATE)	
		NOTIFICATION DEVICE)	
)	
Attorney Ref.	:	OKI 390)	

December 19, 2007

Attn: Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Reply Brief is being filed in response to an Examiner's Answer dated October 31, 2007.

The Examiner's Answer attempts to refute arguments that were presented in Applicants' Appeal Brief, in a "Response to Argument" section on page 7-10 of the Examiner's Answer. In what the Examiner's Answer characterizes as Applicants' "Argument (A)," the Examiner's Answer essentially takes the position that combining the inconsistent techniques of Freivald and Jellum would permit the results obtained using the techniques of one reference to be verified using the techniques of the other. What the

Examiner's Answer does not explain is why an ordinarily skilled person would think that the techniques disclosed by either of the references might yield incorrect results. Why would an ordinarily skilled person think that verification would be desirable?

At the top of page 8, the Examiner's Answer comments that, by combining the two references, "it becomes easy and more precise for one to check to see whether a keyword is present or not in the segment, and then verifies the result by comparing the checksums." An ordinarily skilled person would likely think, though, that any information about keywords in a section would be lost when the section is reduced to a checksum.

Dependent claim 8 recites that "the updated data extracting means has means for compiling a rank, which indicates a degree-of-attention of the web page, in accordance with the frequency of occurrence of updated data having a keyword corresponding to each user terminal," and dependent claim 19 is similar. In what the Examiner's Answer characterizes as "Argument (C)," the Examiner's Answer refers to a passage in column 12 of Freivald and takes the position that the reference meets the scope of the claimed limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited passage in Freivald's column 12 refers to the percentage of sections in a document that have been changed, but a relatively high percentage (for example) of changed sections in the document does not necessarily mean a high frequency of occurrence of a keyword. One sentence in the passage noted in the Examiner's Answer (see column 12, lines 52-56) includes the word "ranks," but in the context of "a combined report ... which ranks the changed pages based on the percentage of sections with mismatching CRC's" (see column 12, lines 52-56). This type of "rank" is different from the rank compiled in claim 8 and claim 19.

For the reasons advanced in Applicants' Appeal Brief and the present Reply Brief, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection should be reversed.

It is assumed that no fee is needed with the present submission. Should this assumption be incorrect, however, any fees that may be needed can be charged to our Deposit Account number 18-0002.

Respectfully submitted,



Allen Wood (Reg. No. 28,134)
Customer No. 23995
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
Telephone: (202) 326-0222
Telefax: (202) 371-8976

AW/ng